

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 25-35 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended herein. No new claims have been added. As a result claims 1-6 and 25-35 are pending for examination, with claims 1 and 6 being independent claims.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite that the first plurality of items of the standard user interface data structure are “associated with the universal printer driver.” Although this aspect of Applicant’s invention was recited in the preamble of each of these claims, it has been added to the body of the claim to further clarify the scope of these claims. The preamble of claim 6 has also been amended to add the words “non-transitory” immediately before “computer-readable storage medium” to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Summary of Office Action

The Office Action rejected claims 6 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as not being directed to statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,366,991 to Snapkauskas et al. (hereinafter Snapkauskas) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0015842 to Nanivadekar et al. (hereinafter Nanivadekar) and U.S. Patent No. 6,831,752 to Matsuo (hereinafter Matsuo). Claims 25-26 and 28-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the asserted combination of Snapkauskas, Nanivadekar, and Matsuo as applied to claims 1-6, and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0163660 to Iwai (hereinafter Iwai) and U.S. Patent No. 7,053,895 to Yamagata et al. (hereinafter Yamagata). Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the asserted combination of Matsuo, Nanivadekar, Iwai, and Yamagata as applied to claim 26, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,046,818 to Ratnaker et al. (hereinafter Ratnaker).

Telephone Interview with Examiner Milia

On July 28, 2010, the undersigned participated in a telephone interview with Examiner Milia. The undersigned thanks Examiner Milia for the courtesies extended to him during that telephone interview.

During the telephone interview, the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §103 were discussed. With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101, Examiner Milia indicated that amending claim 6 to add the words “non-transitory” immediately before

“computer-readable storage medium” would overcome the rejection of claims 6 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103, the undersigned explained how the primary reference Snapkauskas was directed to a user interface associated with an application program, such as Microsoft Project, and not to a user interface associated with a universal printer driver as recited in each of claims 1 and 6. Examiner Milia understood this explanation, and indicated that amending each of claims 1 and 6 to positively recite that the first plurality of items of the standard user interface data structure are associated with the universal printer driver within the body of the claim would further clarify Applicant’s claimed invention.

The undersigned also explained how even if the teachings of Snapkauskas, Nanivadekar, and Matsuo were combined in the manner asserted in the Office Action, that asserted combination would still fail to disclose, teach, or suggest Applicant’s claimed invention. In particular, the undersigned explained how the asserted combination of Nanivadekar and Matsuo fails to teach or suggest those limitations not expressly disclosed in Snapkauskas, namely: linking a first identifier of each respective first object of the first plurality of first objects to a second identifier of each respective second object of the second plurality of second objects through a software interface, hiding each respective item of the first plurality of items of the standard user interface data structure from view of a user, displaying only the customized user interface while hiding the standard user interface from the view of the user, and enabling each item of the second plurality of items to communicate with the universal printer driver through the customized user interface by accessing each respective first object of the first plurality of first objects through the respective second object to which it is linked.

While reserving final judgment, Examiner Milia agreed that after further review of Nanivadekar and Matsuo, the asserted combination of Snapkauskas, Nanivadekar and Matsuo did not appear to teach or suggest a step of linking as set forth in each of Applicant’s claims 1 and 6.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

As noted above, the preamble of claim 6 has been amended to add the words “non-transitory” immediately before “computer-readable storage medium.” Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 6 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

As noted above, each of claims 1 and 6 has been amended to further clarify that Applicant's claimed invention is directed to customizing a standard user interface associated with a universal printer driver by positively reciting this aspect within the body of each independent claim. Because Snapkauskas does not teach or disclose a method or computer software to customized a standard user interface associated with a universal printer driver as recited in claims 1 and 6, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the asserted combination of Snapkauskas, Nanivadekar, and Matsuo be withdrawn.

Furthermore, because the asserted combination of Snapkauskas, Nanivadekar, and Matsuo fails to teach or suggest at least a step of linking as recited in each of claims 1 and 6, each of claims 1-6 patentably distinguishes over the asserted combination of Snapkauskas, Nanivadekar, and Matsuo. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the asserted combination of Snapkauskas, Nanivadekar, and Matsuo, as well as the rejection of claims 25-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the asserted combination of Snapkauskas, Nanivadekar, and Matsuo in view of additional references be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested. This application should now be in condition for allowance; a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, or authorization to charge a deposit account submitted herewith, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50/2762.

Respectfully submitted,

Oliver H. Foehr et al., Applicant

By: /Robert A. Skrivanek, Jr./
Robert A. Skrivanek Jr., Reg. No. 41,316
LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
One Main Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
United States of America
Telephone: 617-395-7000
Facsimile: 617-395-7070

Docket No.: Z2002-702319

Date: August 5, 2010